DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 621 CS 504 329

AUTHOR McAnany, Emile G.
TITLE From Modernization and Diffusion to Dependency and Beyond: Theory and Practice in Communication for Social Change in the 1980s.
PUB DATE 1 Jul 83
NOTE 38p.; Keynote address presented at the Conference on International Communication and Agriculture (Urbana, IL, April 1983).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Research; Developed Nations; *Developing Nations; Economic Development; Intellectual History; *Intercultural Communication; International Relations; *Social Change; *Technological Advancement
IDENTIFIERS *Development Communication; Theory Development; Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

Through a review of development literature, this paper examines the changes that have occurred in thinking about the role of communication in developing nations. The first section of the paper surveys the theories of the past, including those of the neo-classical and Marxist scholars. The section also looks at the emergence of the dependency theory, examines paradigms as research complexes, and discusses theory and practice gaps in communications. The second section of the paper looks to the future and to an integration of theory and practice. Among the topics discussed in this section are (1) the meaning of communication in development; (2) development priorities of the 1980s; (3) Third World communication priorities and expectations in the 1980s, including the role of the new technologies in development, new communication and cultural policies, and alternatives for democratization and participation; (4) potential areas of change in communication, including the organization of people, areas of rural need, and communication technologies and rural development; and (5) new paradigms and practices in the 1980s. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240621

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

From Modernization and Diffusion to Dependency and Beyond: Theory and Practice in Communication for Social Change in the 1980s

July 1, 1983

Emile G. McAnany
International Communications
Department of Radio-Television-Film
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Emile G. McAnany

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504 329

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction p. 1

I. Looking Backward: Old Paradigms and Practices

A. First Generation of Communication Paradigms p. 1

B. New Development Paradigms: Dependency's Entry p. 3

C. Paradigms as Research Complexes p. 5

D. Theory and Practice Gaps in Communications p. 8

II. Looking Ahead: Integrating Theory and Practice p. 10

A. What Does Communication in Development Mean? p. 10

B. What are the Development Priorities of the 1980s? p. 13

C. What are Third World Communication Priorities and Expectations in the 1980s? p. 16

New technologies and information's role in development

New communication and cultural policies

Alternatives for democratization and participation

The International Program for Development in Communication (IPDC)

D. What are the Potential Areas of Change in Communication? p. 19

People organizing

Substantive areas of rural need

Communication technologies and rural development:

Satellites, information technologies and radio

E. New Paradigms and New Practices in the 1980s p. 25

References

"By the mid-1970s it seemed safe to conclude that the dominant paradigm had 'passed', at least as the main model for development in Latin America, Africa and Asia...We summarize these newer conceptions of development by defining development as a widely participatory process of social change in a society, intended to bring about both social and material advancement (including greater equality, freedom, and other value qualities) for the majority of the people through their gaining greater control over their environment."

Rogers "Communication and Development:
The Passing of the Dominent Paradigm" (1976)

Introduction

Standing, as we do, at the threshold of what some have enthuisiastically termed the "information age" where high technology promises not only to make communication the heart of all social activities but also the heart of our economies, we might recall that 1984 is upon us as well. There are others among us who fear that we are entering the world of big brother, newspeak and a watchful technology as Orwell foresaw. But for the mass of the world's population, it may not be modern threats of technology but the age old threats of hunger, poverty, disease and naked violence that seem most pressing and if questioned they might wonder why academics create a fuss over paradigms or technology or theories of development.

Almost a decade ago Everrett Rogers said of the old development (and communication) paradigm that it could be safely concluded that it had passed and that new approaches were promoting new paths to development. The burden of this paper is to take another look backward in order to take another look forward as well to see where the new paths have taken us and where they are -- or not -- likely to lead us in the future.

I. Looking Backward: Old Paradigms and Practices

A. First Generation of Communication Paradigms

The thinking on communication in development must begin with development thinking itself. Many writers were in agreement with Rogers' observation that

by the mid-1970s many of the older approaches were not working and needed reexamination if not discard. A number of development thinkers (mostly economists) gathered in Houston in 1977 to explore a "New Strategy for Development" (Hill 1979). The take-off theory of Rostow or the savings and industrialization emphasis of Nurkse were, of course, criticized by Seers, Streeten, Cardoso, Hirschman and others in the conference. Most of those gathered there seemed to agree that the development record of the previous 25 or 30 years had discredited neo-classicl economic theory's ability to predict development in Third World countries. They also seemed to think that the theories of Marx and other critcal thinkers had contributed to a better understanding of the development process as an interaction between center and periphery countries and their economies. Seers (1979) and Streeten (1979) tended to place pragmatism above either neo-classical or Marxist theory and argued that neither Keynes nor Marx had arrived at solutions to the complex problems of development facing Third World countries. On the other hand, the inclusion of Cardoso from Brazil (1979) was a clear indication that dependency thinking had entered the mainstream of development thinking.

What, then, had happened to the old othrodoxies of the 1950s and 1960s? Had we lost the vision of Daniel Lerner in his early examples of the modernization paradigm, The Passing of Traditional Society, or of the other paradigm, Rogers' own, Diffusion of Innovation (1962) or Communications of Innovations (1971)? It's true that modernization had an important update in 1974 when the long-awaited work by Inkles and Smith, Becoming Modern, was published, but the aftermath was anticlimatic. Although some discussion was sparked in subsequent book reviews, some supportive but more critical, the research area has been almost completely abandoned since then. It is also true that Rogers has been self critical about the role of diffusion in

development (1976), but Rogers has recently come out with another edition of his classic text (1983). It is too early to tell whether this edition will be well received or not in development circles.

B. New Development Paradigms: Dependency's Entry

The history of the shift in development thinking has been abundantly provided in the literature of the past ten years. A good summary can be found in the Houston conference cited above and the conclusions were summarized by Streeten (1979) in his article. He said that by 1977 the following ideas, among others, had been discarded: The Marshall Plan analogy (i.e. European economic take-off after World War II) as appropriate for Third World development; priority on heavy industrialization; a centralized planning approach; import substitution and creation of internal vs. external markets; trickle down theory from highly developed modern sectors; GNP growth as the indicator of development; technical assistance and capital inputs as mechanisms for growth; the Third World as a homogenous group of countries; the "problem" of under-development as internal to the Third World. His view of new strategies for the future were also a summary of much of his colleagues' thinking as well: a basic needs approach for the majority of the poor through improved social services; emphasis on distribution with growth as a measure of development; agriculture as the priority sector of the economy and provisions of credit, inputs, information and market infrastructure for the poor; labor intensive and other appropriate technologies; emphasis on the social and political as well as economic nature of development. He concluded that the lessons of the past 25 years of development thinking showed that both Keynes' emphasis on great ideas and Marx's emphasis on the economic interests of the ruling elite have not adequately explained the complex and sometimes contradictory notion of development.

On the whole, his list is not disssimilar to the one [redacted]ers (1976) details for the related field of development communica[redacted]ns where he proclaimed that the old paradigm had passed. What remained unclear in the treatment by Rogers were three question that we need to examine if we are to interpret the "alternate pathways to development" that he went on to identify. Those questions concern (1) the centrality of a critical or dependency theory to the new approaches, (2) the definition of a paradigm and what would constitute its' passing, and (3) the differentiation between what we would like to see happen (normative statements) and what we expect will happen (descriptive or empirical statements) or, put another way, the difference between theory and practice.

The development thinkers at the Houston meeting acknowledged the strong contribution of Marxist and neo-marxist theory to the evolution in thinking about development. Rogers points to A. G. Frank's contribution to rethinking the older approach but concludes that "...Frank caused considerable academic rethinking about development. And the dust has not yet settled. His writings have served an important sensitizing function, but dependency theory is difficult to 'prove' empirically, even when tested by sociologists sympathetic to Frank's viewpoint." This is all that is said about the matter and one could argue that at the time of the article in the mid 1970s this may have been enough. However, almost ten years later, we might want to reexamine whether this is sufficient treatment. In a 1983 publication, Tulchin, referring to emerging patterns of research among Latin Americanists, could conclude that:

> "Without putting to fine a point on it, the past few years have seen Marxist analysis come out of the closet. This does not mean that all of us have converted to Marxism...What has occurred or is occurring is a gradual convergence of theoretical perspectives...There has been a gradual absorption into the mainstream of the principles and concepts of Marxist theory as well as of its structuralist 'cousins' such as dependency, human ecology, and world-system theory. While there is a

> great benefit in the interpretation of theoretical perspectives, there is danger as well...in other words, of replacing the crippling control of modernization and development theory of the 1950s and 1960s with a new paradigmatic orthodoxy... (p. 89)

The author goes on to say that this overbalance can be countered by the convergence of the functionalist and empiricist methodologies with structuralist theory so that the blending of the two major intellectual traditions (empiricism and dependency) will "enrich our research agenda and quickly spin off new schools critical of this burgeoning orthodoxy" (dependency). We are reminded by this citation, then, that paradigms do seem to replace one another, and we are called to look more closely at what, in this context, a paradigm might mean.

C. Paradigms as Research Complexes

Unfortunately Rogers does not define his use of the word paradigm. But others have discussed the matter at length and provide us with a more refined notion. Alker and Hurwitz (1980), for example, refer to a scientific paradigm as a "research paradigm complex", meaning that we need to talk of a paradigm as a social activity of scholars and not an abstract idea. They define the elements of the complex as follows: external research situation (funding and social pressure among scholars toward an approach); core beliefs (pretheories, models of man and society, normative interpretations, epistemological standards of evidence); coherent scholarly community (a group of scholars sharing core beliefs); originating exemplars (a major systhesis of the paradigm as Lerner's Passing or Cardoso's and Faletto's Dependency (1969); symbolic relationships (the derivation of testable hypotheses from more general theory as Inkles and Smith in Becoming Modern or Rogers' Communication of Innovations); a literature of "successes" leading to new questions (eg. the enormous Latin American literature of structural analysis testing dependency notions).

If we examine these elements briefly concerning the old (moderization/diffusion) and new (dependency/structural) paradigms for the development communication area, some illuminating insights emerge. First, concerning the external research situation, the huge funded projects that lay behind the Inkles and Smith (1974) project or that of Rogers (1970) in the 1960s were not available in the 1970s — and even less so in the 1980s. Some may argue this is why these paradigms are losing ground. The dependency theory, on the other hand, has attracted modest funding in the 1970s but does not seem to need large funding to pursue its research questions. Next core beliefs are crucial areas on which paradigms differentiate themselves. For example, by 1974, when Becoming Modern was finally published, the full-scale attack on moderization in development studies had already been mounted. A number of critical reviewers did not criticize the fine points of methodology of the Inkles and Smith book but rather the whole set of questions the authors had chosen to investigate (Lazarus 1982). Many of the critical scholars in communication during the 1970s attacked the older paradigms not for what they had done, but what they had failed to do (Golding (1974); Felstehausen (1973); Grunig (1970); Roling, Ascroft, and Chegge (1976); Beltran (1974)). The failures most noted by communication critics were ignoring the negative role of social structures in the applications of communication and the lack of understanding of what structural change entails and how communication affected it (Beltran 1976a).

Finally, several other factors of the paradigm complex have changed in the last decade. There clearly has been a growth in a scholarly community supporting a structuralist or dependency approach in communication if one examines the literature from Latin America. Although we are not generally exposed to this literature, there has been not only a proliferation of communication schools in many Latin American countries and consequent research by

faculty and students, but a great deal of book publishing and the emergence of journals and news letters over the past decade. Little of this is available to U.S. audiences in English and circulates only slowly among Spanish speaking U.S. researchers (Beltran 1976b). But there has been only minor acknowledgement of this change by writers from the First World (Rogers 1976, McAnany 1980, Hedebro 1982). Tulchin (1983), cited above, indicates ample academic support, even too much he would say, for such an approach among Latin Americanists in general. It is difficult to point to examples in the form of books in the communication area that are equivalent to Lerner or Rogers but several works concerning the notion of dependent development are found in Cardoso's Dependency (1979), Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970) and, some would argue, Gutierrez's A Theology of Liberation (1973). The Nordenstreng and Varis (1974) UNESCO report on the imbalance in television programming flow throughout the world caused a stir of activity on new international information order questions that culminated in the UNESCO MacBride report (1980) and captured most researchers' attention in the last decade. In the meantime the literature on development and communication was struggling to transform itself from old to new paradigms and dependency did not seem to offer an appropriate positive "exemplar" for this transformation. One reason for this, suggested by Lee (1980), was that dependency was good on diagnosis of the problem of the third world but poor on prescription of the cure. But such an observation, though satisfying on the surface, does not get to the heart of the dilemma. Put in another way, we could argue that at this moment in 1983, the theory underlying much of the new international economic order argument in the 1970s has triumphed, while the possibilities for real economic change in the relations between the First and Third Worlds have failed. In a similar way, the contradictions between the theory and practice of the new

information order can be seen in the call for independence, self-reliance and national control of communication resources promoted by UNESCO's IPDC (International Program for Development Communication), and the feeble response that it has generated among wealthy donor nations for the implementation of its projects. In short, as 1983 begins there seems to be a triumph in theory and a failure in practice.

D. The Theory/Practice Gap in Communications

This gap between the theory (whether it was of the old paradigms or the new) and the practice, as seen in the lives of individuals, may be attacked as a failure of theory to account for reality or, the irrelevance of theory to practice. On the other hand, it may also argue for the failure of practice to heed theory. We need to explore both of these possibilities.

It is clear that in most scientific thinking theory is an attempt to explain phenomena of the real world. The heart of the development problem over the last three decades lies in the series of contradictions that seem so glaring as to demand such an explanation: why is half the world's population in 1983 malnourished when there are food surpluses elsewhere? why is the life expectancy 57 years in the poorest 33 countries and 74 in the advanced countries when science is a common heritage of mankind? why, in 1980, was all foreign assistance only $36 billion when expenditures on armaments was $550 billion? or why was the gap between the rich and the poor countries in terms of economic wealth growing instead of shrinking over the three decades of development efforts? (World Bank 1982, IDA 1982, Sivard 1981)

There are, of course, a variety of perfectly reasonable responses to these phenomena. Development theories have focused on an explanation for this "problem" that Third World countries have had. It was Rostow (1959) who turned to economic history to explain the gap between First and Third World countries and predict that with certain prescribed ways of behaving,

other countries could experience the take-off the West and Japan had achieved in the 19th and 20th centuries. It was the ECLA group and Latin America thinkers like Sunkle and Cardoso who also turned to history in the early 1960s to explain why this expected take-off had not occurred in Latin America and could not, as long as the international economic system remained the way it was. On the pragmatic side, OPEC, in the 1970s made an attempt to change the system and transfer some of the wealth from the First to a portion of the Third World's countries. Today, it is not at all clear whether the OPEC cartel will hold together, but it is clear that any new economic order is a long way down the road, if possible at all. And everyone seems to know what is wrong yet no one seems to have a solution.

If this is true of the macro level concerning the economic growth of nations, what of the theories of communication in development? The scenario here has been much the same as in the economic sphere although there has been no equivalent of OPEC in communication. The disenchantment with moderization was noted by Inayatullah as early as 1965 in a meeting at the East-West Center in the very presence of the creators of the old paradigms themselves. But it was the late 1960s and early 1970s when Grunig (1969, 1971) and his mentor, Felstehausen (1974), at Wisconsin first became cognizant of the discrepancy between communication paradigms and the reality of social structures in rural Latin America. Rogers (1976) himself called together critics of his own paradigm and seemed to concede the passing of some kind of approach by the mid 1970s — if not specifically of diffusion itself. Roling, Ascroft and Chegge (1976), Beltran (1976) and Bordenave (1976) all made specific critiques of diffusion. In a series of studies in the latter part of the decade, Contreras (1980), O'Sullivan (1980) and Lenglet (1980) tested the impact of information on a variety of rural audiences in Latin America and Africa and found the old

paradigms lacking. One might read this literature as an undermining of old theories rather than the creation of new, and justify the remark by Lee (1980) cited above on how certain approaches are good at diagnosis of the problem but poor on prescription. To address this problem we must turn to both theory and practice and begin the long, hard struggle for a new synthesis.

II. Looking Ahead: Integrating Theory With Practice

It would be tempting to begin this section with a series of predictions as to what communiction's role might be in the theories of development for the 1980s or 1990s, but a more modest objective of this section will be to examine the context of development as it exists today and then to conclude with some thoughts as to how the new paradigms might best be realistically incorporated into communication planning and implementation in Third World countries. The context of develpoment will center around the answer to four questions: (a) What does communication mean in the development thinking of today? (b) What are world development priorities as defined by major lending institutions (and are they the priorities of the Third World)? (c) What seem to be the communication priorities of Third World countries? (d) What seem to be the most promising areas of change that communication can assist in? The final section will attempt to answer a fifth question in light of responses to the other four questions. (e) What is the relationship of a new paradigm to practice for communication in the coming years?

A. What does communication in development mean?

There was a debate in the 1970s about the notion of development journalism (Aggarwala, 1980; Lent 1979) and considerable question about communication's role in development (Hornik 1980; McAnany 1980). The major change from previous paradigms, especially that of Lerner in The Passing of Traditional Society, is the serious questioning of whether mass communications is an

independent variable and a signficant positive motor for change in development. Hornik (1980) has argued that communication can be a "complement" to positive change under certain conditions but is not a variable independent of context. Dependency theorists of different schools have reintroduced the notion of communication as a powerful external force (of capitalsim) generally hindering positive social change (cf. Beltran and Fox 1979, Mattelart 1973,1975), but some others have argued that viewing communication as a tool of an external imperialism and giving the impression that it is too powerful to counter is misplaced (Salinas and Paldan, 1979; Sarti 1981).

The debate of the last decade has made it clear that communication is complex, and, moreover, it cannot, without danger of bias, be removed from its social context. As a first conclusion from this debate, it can be argued, as Felstehausen (1973) did early on, that communication is part of a social system. We might add in the 1980s that the notion of social system has both national and international aspects. One of the few serious attempts to take the national context into account in studying a communication project was White's (1977) study of a Radio School in Honduras. The international context of communication projects refers, for example, to those international market influences that touch even the most remote rural areas. Esteva's (1983) description of the Mexican agricultural development policies indicate the acute problems of food sufficiency that Mexico has faced for almost two decades after it let international market forces dictate food production (more on this below).

A second aspect of what communication and development has come to mean at present is related to the debate on development journalism and the NIIO discussions of the 1970s. It was argued that journalism in a given country should gear itself toward the promotion of national development goals and not simply follow the style of a western commercial press. On the whole,

this approach was a positive one, but it contributed to some excessive cases, as in the Philippines (Encanto 1982), where the press simply became the arm for promoting government programs and proclaimed them successful as a form of propaganda. What has emerged as a compromise between government controlled and commercial media are a number of private, non-commercial groups who aim to provide information for development.

Two kinds of information for development are referred to in this context. The first comes from the series of development data bases, including one on agriculture, AGRICOLA, and others related to other areas of interest like health and technology (Mahan 1981). The effort in development work is to make much of this information available to Third World users on a cost or even a subsidized basis. The second kind of information service becoming available through some alternative information groups concerns important news stories about and from the Third World, stories that the four major western news services do not generally provide. Inter Press Service (IPS), a non-profit, cooperative news service with headquarters in Rome, has recently expanded and now has coverage of much of the Third World as well as First and Second World stories relevant to the Third World (Hall 1983). Interlink, a new non-profit group in New York which carries IPS stories to customers in the U.S., has just begun a computerized service that promises to get stories to newspapers and other development users in the U.S. cheaply and efficiently. IPS serves as a South-South link as well as a South-North one. The role of IPS and similar services is to provide news about Third World development that represents a broader picture than the general crisis-oriented news of the commercial services. Such alternative new services are ideological in the broad sense of helping to redefine news values about development and to break through stereotypes of western publics about what development means. This kind of

information for the public could also serve to promote public support for foreign assistance in the First World and especially the U.S.

B. What are the Development Priorities of the 1980s?

The stark realities of 1983 are that even the so-called advanced countries are facing high unemployment, inflation and depressed exports. The OPEC cartel is in turmoil and seeking to support its major development investments through lower prices and pumping quotas. The promising new industrializing countries (NICs) like Brazil and Mexico are struggling with serious external debt burdens as well as slow-downs in exports. Finally, the so-called "low-income economies" (read "poorest countries") of the world are threatened with poor exports as well as lower levels of external aid and are literally struggling for survival. The mood has changed a great deal from the mid-1970s when OPEC had fired up expectations about NIEO possibilities and other strategies for exerting pressure and North to South transfers were seriously being pressed.

At this point in time, the reality of international economic structures and their resistence to change has begun to sink in for Third World countries; also the political reality of how the Northern contries can resist even the acute pressures of the OPEC decade. The Non-Aligned group of nations have made their periodic protest agaisnt unjust international structures in New Delhi recently but have also recognized that change is neither easy nor rapid. One new insight to emerge within the constraints of the current depressed economic circumstances is the realization by the Third World that if their economic prosperity is indeed tied to that of the first World (confirming much of the dependency analysis of the 1970s), it is also true that the First World private financial system is now dependent upon the large debt-burdened borowers of the Third World and that if a Brazil or Mexico or Nigeria were to default on their payments, there would be omnious consequences for the international economic

system. Some might cheerfully call this an increase in "interdependence" but, given the adversarial nature of NIEO, we might more rightly call it a two-way dependency relationship. The consequence has been that the help that the Third World demanded in NIEO in the last ten years, and did not receive, may be more quickly forthcoming in harder times in what we might call the post-NIEO period. As a consequence, the U.S. and the IMF have quickly moved to reschedule debts for troubled countries and have agreed to increase help to the poorest countries through the World Bank (WB) and the International Development Association (IDA).

We should look at what priorities these major lending agencies have for development over the next few years in order to realistically assess where major aid funding will go. The priority for almost all major multilateral aid institutions is a concentration on the rural poor (the overwhelming majority of the 33 low-income nations and the absolute majorities in many middle-income countries as well). What does this mean? It means in many countries a series of concrete objectives such as the following: (1) an increase in the production of food for internal consumption; (2) an increase in agricultural research adapted to the local conditions; (3) an increase by governments in allocations to agricultural budgets; (4) an examination of incentive structures for agricultural production; (5) an increase in the provision of agricultural infrastructure (irrigation, transport, market networks) and the provision of credit, inputs (fertilizers, etc.), technology and information; and (6) an increase in social services for rural populations (education, health, nutrition, family planning) (World Bank 1982, IDA 1982).

What this focus entails is the shift in attention from simply increasing agricultural output, as was the case of the Green Revolution, to a concern for the majority of small farmer producers in many countries, who could not

participate in the economic benefits but often bore the social costs of the Green Revolution. What this may entail is emphasis on the most difficult part of the problem, the social and economic structures that have prevented more than a subsistence living to majorities of rural people in many Third World countries. The increased urgency of agrarian and land reform is only one of the more acute problems in land scarce regions (e.g. Central America, north-east Brazil). In addition are the problems of the sheer size of the need (these are majority populations), isolation (they have been least attended by government agencies), bureaucracy (can government agencies efficiently administrate large projects?) and international pressures (can governments resist transnational interests working against food sufficiency?).

The question of whether these development priorities concerning the rural poor are priorities of governments is difficult to answer. The bloody struggle for agrarian reform in Central America, and specifically El Salvador, is an indicator that changes for the poor rural majorities will not be easy because changes in land tenancy often threaten the interests of local land holders. The threats to vested international interests among agribusinesses is outlined by Esteva (1983) in his analysis of Mexico's great food dependency in the 1980s after being a net exporter of food twenty years earlier. There are, however, major efforts by some governments to invest in projects for improving the lives of their rural majorities in agricultural productivity and in areas of social services like education, nutrition and health. Many governments and members of the development community who were disenchanted with the results of the earlier communication-development paradigms are, under new paradigm assumptions, turning once again to communications as an important tool for change.

C. What are Third World Communication Priorities and Expectations in the 1980s?

It is impossible to accurately describe communication priorities for Third World countries in the 1980s, but perhaps some guesses may be made about the expectations raised over the past decade of debate about a new international information order. The culmination of the debate was the publication and approval of the findings and recommendations of the UNESCO committee headed by Sean MacBride (UNESCO 1980). The nature of the document called the MacBride Report (Many Voices, One World: Communication and Society Today and Tomorrow) has been examined and criticized by a number of authors, but for all the shortcomings of such a compromise document, it probably does identify many of the expectations and aspirations of Third World countries concerning communication. In the last chapter, the commission lists a series of some eight areas for recommendations of how to overcome the obstacles as well as take advantage of communication technologies and practices for achieving national development goals and improved international cooperation. We will focus on four that seem most central.

New technologies and information's role in development: The report seems to prefer the rapid incorporation of the new information technologies (satellites, computers, telecommunications and broadcast) into the development plans for all countries. Although some cautions are voiced about the problems of giving priority to high technology, the commisiion seems to feel that countries that do not follow this policy will be left behind in this rapidly developing sector of many economies in the First World. What is not clear in the text is the answer to a number of the problems facing such a national policy decision although others have noted these elsewhere (H. Schiller 1981, Rada 1981, D. Schiller 1982). What may be more relevant in

this paper is the question as to whether a highly modern information sector of a Third World economy can directly or indirectly contribute to the rural poor. We will touch on the answer to this question below.

New communication and cultural policies: The MacBride Commission has placed a good deal of emphasis on the formation of national communication policies in which development goals are integrated with communication development (from creation of infrastructure to improved training). The notion is a sensible one which sees the sum of national resources in communication as an important sector of the economy to be placed at the service of national development. Two problems arise, however: first, many countries that have large privately-owned commercial media sectors (most of Latin America and an increasing number of countries in Asia) have interests that do not necessarily coincide with those of the nation; second, even when a nation controls the major portion of its communication resources, the success it has in redirecting these resources toward rural populations and equalization policies between urban and rural areas is problematic at best (cf. The Peruvian experience in the 1970s, Atwood and Mattos, 1982).

The concern over the cultural impact of imported television programs and other cultural products, along with the influence of a transnationalized media advertising base, (Lee 1980, Mattos 1982, McAnany, in press) has prompted a number of countries to develop policies to protect their cultures. The reality in most countries, however, seems to be that, like communication policies, cultural policies may become only official aspirations or goals without incorporating mechanisms to implement actions to protect and promote local cultures.

Alternatives for democratization and participation: A theme that runs through much of the MacBride Report is an idea commonly espoused by governments: access of all peoples to communication and information and

their right to freely communicate. Although the idea of participation is an attractive one and one to which writers have begun to give serious attention (Somovia 1981, Reyes Matta 1981), the problems facing the implementation of the notion are both theoretical (Jouet 1980) and practical (O'Sullivan and Kaplun 1980). For rural people the problems may be multiplied by the lack of almost any communications infrastructure, even of the most rudimentary kind (Shore 1980). Nevertheless, there is sometimes an advantage in isolation. The point not made in the MacBride Report but emphasized by several of the writers mentioned above is that democratization must first be created in a community and that in turn communities will make use of communications resources and technology to serve their own purposes.

The International Program for Development in Communication (IPDC): During the 1970s as western commercial media and many western nations tried to fight off the "attacks" of Unesco and the new information order supporters, there was confrontation over the issues. Finally, as many First World nations began to conclude that problems indeed existed in the distribution of information around the world, some, like the U.S., responded with promises of international aid for infrastructure and training. The IPDC, proposed by Unesco subsequent to the Belgrade meeting in 1980 as the multilateral agency for the distribution of this aid, became the focus of great expectations by many Third World countries. The hope was that after all the acrimonious debate stirred up by the NIIO, the First World would commit significant funds for communication purposes. But after a meeting in Acapulco in July of 1982, it became clear that funds would not be forthcoming in sufficient amounts to fund even a small amount of the needs for infrastructure and training.

Several reasons can be suggested for this failure: the recession in 1981-82 meant a lowering of all aid giving by the First World; the

preference of many countries, especially the U.S., for bilateral giving where aid is more closely controlled by foreign policy considerations; and the size of needs vs. the likely amounts to be available for communications projects. The more basic reason, however, is one underlying the NIEO debates on reduction in the economic advantages long held by the West over the Third World: how does IPDC serve the interests of the West? With the oil threat abating somewhat for the time and the free flow/sovereignty issue of NIIO somewhat shelved after the MacBride Report publication, the West seems in no hurry to make good on promises proposed at the height of the controversy of five years ago. Nor is it clear that the international aid agencies like the World Bank and IDA or the major bilateral agencies like the U.S. Agency for International Development or the French FAC are doing more in this area. We might ask, then, what are the opportunities for communication applications in rural development and their likelihood of implementation over the next few years.

D. What are the Potential Areas of Change in Communication?

There are three areas where the evidence seems to indicate that there is a real potential for applying communication for poor rural majorities with some reasonable promise of success. In each case, however, we will need to carefully define the underlying assumptions.

People organizing: There are two very contrary assumptions often working in rural communications' efforts: one is that rural poor people are willing and able to organize and can have rapid impact on their environment once they are organized; the other is that organizations of rural people are difficult to begin and even more so to maintain. In a sense, both are right. It seems that significant change in rural areas can not take place without the mobilization of the poor majority. But it is also true that the success of such mobilizations is unfortunately rare. For people interested

in communications' role in significant change in the rural Third World, mobilization seems a sine qua non. Whether it is happening and how it can work are very different stories. We provide three brief examples to suggest how in some circumstances it can and does succeed.

The Latin American Radio Schools are organized into an international association (ALER) with over 40 members of private groups (usually but not always with affiliations with the Catholic Church) who operate (or in a few cases lease time on) radio stations to reach millions of the rural poor throughout 19 Latin American countries. In a recent study of 27 of its affiliates (ALER 1982), several conclusions became clear. Most of the Radio Schools had not only survived over a number of years (most were begun in the 1960s), but their audiences seemed to have increased. There was an even greater need to bring the information and support to audiences now than ten or twenty years ago. The other conclusion was that the Radio Schools were fundamentally an organization of people rather than a social service, and their strength related to the continuing need of audiences and the dedication of Radio School organizations and their identification with the needs and lives of their audiences. In this context, the content or ideology of the programs is as important as the techniques used to reach audiences (largely by radio, print, and face-to-face contact).

The second example is closely related to the first, viz. the network of Church related comunidades de base, or base Christian communities, that has grown up in Latin America over the years since the Catholic Bishops of Latin America officially proclaimed their solidarity with the poor at the Medellin Conference in 1968 (Lernoux 1980). It was said that a major threat to the government party in the 1982 national elections in Brazil were the more than 80,000 base communities among the poor. These communities are

essentially a functioning network of people who carry out certain communal activities that are religious, social and political. Some would say that interpersonal communication is the fundamental underlying activity, but these communities have mobilized other forms of communication, including the mass media (e.g. through the Radio Schools) in struggling for their basic human and civil rights.

The third example comes from Mexico, where in 1980 the government promoted a major effort to increase agricultural productivity by giving the majority small peasant producers a significant amount of aid in the system called SAM (Sistema Alimentaria Mejicana). Esteva (1983) indicates that the Mexican peasant responded with a 50% increase in production in one year but that after a year, bureaucratic and political pressures meant that the system was beginning to be undermined. The point Esteva makes, however, is that this brief interlude indicates that peasants, left to themselves and with enough material support, can organize themselves into highly productive work units. This argument is basically a people mobilization arguement that goes contrary to much received wisdom about rural development that the need for outside organization and prior education are prerequisites for any increase in productivity among small farmers. Just as media have for so long carried stereotypes of the backward peasant, they could be turned to the opposite task of promoting peasant control of agriculture.

Substantive areas of rural need: In addition to the focus upon mobilizing people for change, the problems where communication might affect rural development will be related to those areas where need has been identified as the most significant: agricultural productivity for small as well as large farmers; rural social services such as education, health and nutrition. The potential for change in those areas may only be as great as the circumstances of the given countries. Where governments are unwilling

to promote changes or allow the rural poor to mobilize for their own changes, then the potential is negligible.

In the areas of agricultural productivity, the use of information to encourage innovation adoption has been demonstrated in several projects (AED 1978, Hornik 1982), but no final conclusions about effectiveness have been reached. If government attention to the problem and aid provided by bilateral and multilateral agencies is an indication of the urgency of the problem, then the increase in productivity will be of critical importance and the contribution of communication will be an area of continuing interest to lending institutions as well as to countries.

In the health and nutrition fields, there are several promising projects that may lead to improvements for rural populations. The idea of using advertising for purposes of social marketing of family planning techniques has had some success. The same idea applied to health and nutrition was tried in several pilot projects (Cooke and Romweber 1977), but it is now being given more carefully controlled trials in Honduras and the Gambia. The basic idea is that brief messages carefully constructed and repeated over six months on the radio can provide a genuine learning mechanism for applying simple health and nutrition practices by rural audiences. This approach has the advantage of not depending on field personnel or printed material reaching isolated rural audiences and lowers costs as well as increases effectiveness. Preliminary results indicate promise in the learning and even practice area, but it is too soon to examine impacts on health status (Foote 1982).

In education, the hope of providing schooling to the rural populations depends heavily on the willingness of traditional ministries of education to adopt nontraditional strategies to reach people in a "distance education"

mode where people learn on their own or in informal groups. The evidence for young adults, teachers and working people is encouraging, but evidence of its broad application to rural adults is still lacking (McAnany et al, in press). Nevertheless, in times of reduced budgets and growing educational needs, the use of communication technology to bring information and education to people will continue. The Peoples Republic of China has undertaken a major modernization effort and within three or four years has developed the largest open university in the world. It is estimated that it may be serving as many as a million students via television within a few years.

Technologies and rural development: The final area of promise is the variety of communication technologies now available on the international markets. But such technology has an "uncertain promise" as Goulet (1977) has pointed out. What seems most cost-effective for one group may be from a larger point of view counterproductive for the society as a whole. Nevertheless, we should comment briefly on those technologies that may offer benefits for rural populations if employed carefully within the context of each country.

Satellites: There are currently an increasing number of Third World countries leasing time from INTELSAT for internal telecommunications use. In addition a number of larger countries are moving toward purchasing their own domestic satellites. Indonesia was the first country to do so several years ago, and the record is not clear as to whether this technology has provided the rural majortiy with concrete benefits or not that would justify the enormous costs. India had a one year experiment with a satellite in a project called SITE and has now moved ahead with building its own satellite that should be launched soon. Both Brazil and Mexico have contracted for satellites to be launched in early 1985 and Colombia and the Arab States seem

to be moving toward final contract decisions. At the same time the U.S. Agency for International Development has launched an ambitious program to demonstrate the usefulness of satellites for rural development, but results are not yet available.

The question to be asked at this point is not whether satellites can be a cost-effective substitute for terrestrial systems or whether they can serve the needs of the rural majorities. Rather the question is whether governments will be able to use them for this population at costs that are competitive with other forms of communication already available. The major drawback is the centralized nature of such high cost technology. Since each country is distinct and has a different set of priorities and a different development history, we will have to wait for empirical results. There has been relatively little published on the Indonesian experience, but what is known suggests that it is not the hardware but its social organization that may be lacking.

Information technologies: At a recent conference in Paris, the title seemed to be daring and forward looking. It was the "Barefoot Micro Chip" and it seemed to promise all of the marvelous benefits of the home computer "revolution" in the U.S. to the villages of India or the Andean highlands. It is not that information is not useful, even crucial, for many rural poor people, but the implication that a home computer in every farm house in the Third World will be the answer to what are both political and social problems of long standing is a disturbing continuation of technocratic ideology. Agricultural research centers in a number of countries can benefit from on-line information via computers, and telephones can clearly serve rural needs (Hudson 1982), but the assumptions of other favorable conditions for change are critical. More needs to be done concerning the

provision of cheap and reliable two-way communication because of the savings in travel alone, but until we have more catalogued experiences and know more about implementation, many of the proposed benefits will remain unfulfilled.

Radio: Radio remains the oldest of the broadcast technologies and one of the cheapest. It also is the most widely distributed means of communication among rural populations in the Third World. The only comment that needs to be made at this point is the observation that this and other small and relatively cheap technologies (the rural press, perhaps a telephone and, someday, a microprocessor) are the means most likely to be used by people mobilizing themselves as instruments under their control and geared toward their own change. There is already sufficient evidence that small radio stations can serve rural people (ALER 1982, Jamison and McAnany 1978, Hall 1978, McAnany 1973). What may still be lacking are modest amounts of aid for hardware and training for those local groups who already know what they want and are looking for means to mobilize others.

Technologies remain two-edged swords and can either be instruments of liberation or pacification. Their application depends, to a great extent, on the context in which they are used and the basic development model informing that use. We turn now to a final question on new and old paradigms in practice.

E. New Paradigms and New Practices in the 1980s

We began this paper with a quote, written in the mid 1970s, that stated that the old paradigm has passed, but it was not entirely clear what new paradigm would take its place. As we detailed what some have called the research paradigm complex, the elements that might compose a new paradigm were outlined. Yet the danger for development practice was that we would mistake the consensus of academics for the prevailing situation of the real world and the existing obstacles to social change. It is clear that pro-

claiming development to be "a widely participatory process of social change... to bring about both social and material advancement...for the majority of the people through gaining greater control over their environment" (Rogers 1976) would be readily accepted as an ideal by many academics. But when such efforts are implemented in reality in a place like Central America, they become complicated with real world realities and sharp political conflicts.

There are several conclusions that we might tentatively make about paradigms and practices at this point. Whatever we want to call the new development paradigm, one dimension of it that must be included is an aspect that the dependency writers introduced almost two decades ago: Third World economies, and the most vulnerable sectors of those economies in rural areas, are affected by the structures of the international economic system. It is not just dependency thinkers who recognize this but the neo-classical economists at places like the World Bank. The secondary conclusion that follows from this is one raised by Esteva (1983), and it is that international market forces in agriculture affect the policies that impact on even the small farmers of countries like Mexico. Policy decisions about what is more cost-effective to produce or import have implications that directly affect basic survival questions for peasants regarding food security and even land tenancy. The international market forces that push for exports and concentration of land to provide more efficiency in export also affects the explosive issue of land reform in a number of countries.

The second set of conclusions about communications in development also touch on the issues raised by dependency. The overriding importance of context and social structure was raised by Felstehausen (1973) in discussing development communication and empirically tested by Grunig (1971),

O'Sullivan (1980), and Contreras (1980). The inclusion of context and, specifically, the role of social structure in a given situation will be a necessary consideration in any future communication planning in the coming decade.

Finally, there is an issue of values in the paradigm of the 1980s. There remains a negative connotation of the word "value" in the context of social science or of development planning. This is a bias that is primarily found in the U.S. (Halloran 1981) but is shared by some others in international lending institutions (where economists seem to predominate). For development thinkers in the past three decades, certain values have always been implicit in their theories, but it has only been in the conflictive decade on the 1970s with the new order debates and OPEC that the place of values in development thinking has come out of the closet. The new paradigm guiding communication in and for development must include a clarification of development for whom, otherwise it leaves out the basis for making decisions in practice. If technology, whether it be communication technology or agricultural innovations, is to provide benefits we must ask for whom these benefits are to be provided. Clearly the Green Revolution did benefit many people, but it just as clearly did not benefit all—or even the majority in many cases. The inclusion of value positions in a new paradigm will not only clarify how the paradigm operates but what practical choices it dictates.

The conclusion of this paper is not that all people accept the paradigm as I have outlined it, neither among academics nor among practitioners. Rather, it is based on the recognition among those who are working toward genuine change (which policies in rural development should imply) that structural problems and their political consequences are the primary obstacles to change and that if we are committed to explaining this

phenomenon as well as in changing it, we need to go beyond modernization and diffusion. It is no easy struggle to promote change and no immediate prospects for it are obvious in the rural majorities of most countries; but if the aim is to understand the situation before acting upon it, then the 1980s may hopefully be the beginning for change and that rural majorities may benefit from it before the twenty-first century is upon us.

References

AED (Academy for Educational Development), 1978. The Basic Village Education Project, Guatemala: Final Report. Washington, D.C. AED.

N. Aggarwala, 1980. "A New Journalism," Intermedia, 1.

ALER (Associacion Latino Americana de Escuelas Radiofonicas), 1982. E. Contreras and R. de Dios Analisis de los Sistemas de Educacion Radiofonica. Quito, Ecuador: ALER.

H. Alker, R. Hurwitz, 1980. Resolving Prisoner's Dilemmas. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.

R. Attwood, S. Mattos, 1982. "Mass Media Reform and Social Change: The Peruvian Experience", Journal of Communication, 32, 2.

L. R. Beltran, 1974. "Rural Development and Social Communication: Relationships and Strategies" in Communication Strategies for Rural Development: Proceedings of the Cornell-CIAT International Symposium. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

L.R. Beltran, 1976a. "Social Structure and Rural Development Communication in Latin America: The 'Radiophonic Schools' of Columbia" in Chu et al (eds) Communication for Group Transformation in Development. Honolulu: East-West Communication Institute.

L.R. Beltran, 1976b. "Alien Premises, Objects, Methods in Latin American Communication Research", Communication Research, 3, no. 2.

L.R. Beltran and E. Fox, 1979. "Latin America and the United States: Flaws in the Free Flow of Information" in Nordentreng and Schiller (eds) op. cit.

J. Diaz Bordenave, 1976. "Communication of Agricultural Innovations in Latin America: The Need for New Models," Communication Research, 3, no. 2.

F. Cardoso, 1979. "The Originality of the Copy: The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Idea of Development" in Hill (ed) Toward a New Strategy for Development. New York: Pergamon Press.

F. Cardoso and E. Faletto, 1969. Dependencia e Desenvolvimento na America Latina. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Zahar.

E. Contreras, 1980. "Brazil and Guatemala: Communications, Rural Modernity, and Structural Constraints" in McAnany (ed) Communications in the Rural Third World: New York: Praeger Publishers.

T. Cooke and S. Romweber, 1977. Radio Advertising Techniques and Nutrition Education: A Summary of a Field Experiment in the Philippines and Nicaragua. New York: Manoff International.

G. Encanto, 1982. "Development Journalism in the Philippines" in Atwood et al (eds) International Perspectives on News. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

G. Esteva, 1983. "Food Self-Reliance and Peasant Self-Management: Bases for the Agrarian Transformation of Mexico." Mimeo, Institute of Latin American Studies, University of Texas at Austin.

H. Felstehausen, 1973. "Conceptual Limits of Development Communication Theory", Rural Sociology, 38.

D. Foote, 1982. Personal communication with the author.

P. Freire, 1970. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder.

P. Golding, 1974. "Media Role in National Development: Critique of a Theoretical Orthodoxy," Journal of Communication, 24, 1.

D. Goulet, 1977. The Uncertain Promise: Value Conflicts in Technology Transfer. New York: IDOC/North America.

J. Grunig, 1969. "Information and Decision Making in Economic Development," Journalism Quarterly, 46.

J. Grunig, 1971. "Communication and Economic Decision Making of Colombian Peasants," Economic Development and Cultural Change, 18.

G. Gutierrez, 1973. A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics and Salvation. New York: Orbis.

B. Hall, 1978. Mtu Ni Afya: Tanzania'z Health Campaign. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development.

P. Hall, 1983. "What's All the Fuss About Interpress?" Columbia Journalism Review, January-February.

J. Halloran, 1981. "The Context of Mass Communication Research" in McAnany, Schnitman and Janus (eds) Communication and Social Structure: Critical Studies in Mass Media Research. New York:Praeger Publishers.

G. Hedebro, 1982. Communication and Social Change in Developing Nations: A Critical View. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

K. Hill (ed), 1979. Toward a New Strategy for Development. New York: Pergamon.

R. Hornik, 1980. "Communication as Complement in Development," Journal of Communication, 30, 2.

R. Hornik, 1982. Communication and Agriculture. Stanford: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University. (Also Annenberg School of Communication, University of Pennsylvania).

H. Hudson, 1982. "Toward a Model for Predicting Development Benefits from Telecommunication Investment" in Jussawalla and Lamberton (eds) Communication Economics and Development. New York: Pergamon.

A. Inkles and D. Smith, 1974. Becoming Modern: Individual Change in Six Developing Countries. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

International Development Association, 1982. IDA in Retrospect: The First Two Decades of the International Development Association. New York: Oxford University Press (for the World Bank).

D. Jamison and E. McAnany, 1978. Radio for Education and Development. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

J. Jouet, 1980. "Participatory Communication in the Third World: A Critical Outlook." Paper presented in the First Seminar on Participatory Communication, CIESPAL, Quito, Ecuador.

W. Lazarus, 1982. Private communication with author.

C. Lee, 1980. Media Imperialism Reconsidered: The Homogenizing of Television Culture. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

F. Lenglet, 1980. "The Ivory Coast: Who Benefits from Education/Information in Rural Television?" in McAnany, op.cit.

J. Lent, 1979. "The Evolution of Development Communication: A Brief History" in Lent and Vilanilan (eds) The Use of Development News. Singapore: AMIC (Asian Mass Communication Research and Information Center).

P. Lernoux, 1980. Cry of the People. New York: Doubleday & Company.

D. Lerner, 1958. The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East. New York: Basic Books.

E. Mahan, 1981. "Computers and Development: On-Line Bibliographic Retrieval Systems." Paper presented at Western Association Social Science Association, San Diego.

A. Mattelart, 1973. Agresion Desde el Espacio: Cultura y Nepalm en la Era de los Satelites. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno.

A. Mattelart, 1975. "Hecia le Formacion de los Aparatos Ideologicos del 'Estado Multinacional,'" Communicacion y Cultura, 4.

S. Mattos, 1982. "Domestic and Foreign Advertising in Television and Mass Media Growth: A Case Study of Brazil." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

E. McAnany, 1973. Radio's Role in Development: Five Strategies of Use. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development.

E. McAnany (ed), 1980. Communication in the Rural Third World: The Role of Information in Development. New York: Praeger Publishers.

E. McAnany, in press. "The Logic of Cultural Industries in Latin America: The Television Industry in Brazil," in Mosco and Wasko (eds) Critical Communicat Review, vol.2. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

E. McAnany, J.B. Oliveira, F. Orivel and J. Stone, in press. "Distance Education: Evaluating New Approaches in Education for Developing Countries," to appear in an issue of Evaluation in Education: International Progress.

K. Nordenstreng and H. Schiller (eds) 1979. National Sovereignty and International Communication. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

K. Nordenstreng and T. Varis, 1974. Television Traffic -- A One-Way Street? Paris: Unesco, Reports and Papers on Mass Communication, #70.

J. O'Sullivan, 1980. "Guatemala: Marginality and Information in Rural Development in the Western Highlands," in McAnany op. cit.

J. O'Sullivan and M. Kaplun, 1980. Communications Methods to Promote Grass-Roots Participation: A Summary of Research Findings from Latin America. Paris: Unesco, Communication and Society, #6.

J. Rada, 1981. "The Microelectronics Revolution: Implications for the Third World," Development Dialogue, 2.

F. Reyes Matta, 1981. "A Model for Democratic Communication," Development Dialogue, 2.

E. Rogers, 1961. Diffusion of Innovations. New York: Basic Books.

E. Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971. The Communication of Innovations. New York: Basic Books.

E. Rogers, 1976. "Communication and Development: The Passing of the Dominant Paradigm," Communication Research, 3, 2.

E. Rogers, 1983. The Diffusion of Innovations (Third Edition) New York: Basic Books.

W. Rostow, 1960. The Stages of Economic Growth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

R. Salinas and Paldan, 1979. "Culture in the Process of Dependent Development: Theoretical Perspectives" in Nordenstreng and Schiller (eds) op.cit.

I. Sarti, 1981. "Communication and Cultural Dependency: A Misconception" in McAnany et al (eds) op. cit.

D. Seers, 1979. "Introduction: The Congruence of Marxism and Other Neoclassical Doctrines" in Hill op.cit.

D. Schiller, 1982. Telematics and Government. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishers.

H. Schiller, 1981. Who Knows? Information in the Age of the Fortune 500. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishers

L. Shore, 1980. "Mass Media for Development: A Reexamination of Access, Exposure, and Impact" in McAnany op.cit.

R. Sivard, 1981. World Military and Social Expenditure, 1981. Leesburg, Virginia: World Priorities.

J. Somovia, 1981. "The Democratization of Communications: From Minority Social Monopoly to Majority Social Representation," Development Dialogue, 2.

P. Streeten, 1979. "Development Ideas in Historical Perspective," in Hill, op.cit.

J. Tulchin, 1983. "Emerging Patterns of Research in the Study of Latin America," Latin American Research Review, 18, 1.

Unesco, 1980. Many Voices, One World: Communications and Society Today and Tomorrow. New York: Unipub (MacBride Commission Report).

R. White, 1977. "Mass Communication and the Popular Promotion Strategy of Rural Development in Honduras," in Spain, Jamison and McAnany (eds) Radio for Education and Development: Case Studies. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, Working Paper, 266, 2 volumes.

World Bank, 1982. World Development Report, 1982. New York: Oxford University Press (for the World Bank).